



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,243	07/31/2003	Kimberly D. Seaman	020420	1608
26285	7590	12/08/2009	EXAMINER	
K&L GATES LLP			EBERSMAN, BRUCE I	
535 SMITHFIELD STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222			3691	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/631,243	Applicant(s) SEAMAN ET AL.
	Examiner BRUCE I. EBERSMAN	Art Unit 3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-30 and 32-42 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-30 and 32-420 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/18/09

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1,3,4,7-30,32-42 pending. On 9/18/09, the applicant filed an amendment canceling claim 31 and amending claims 1,12, 16,19,21,22,23,25,30,32,33,38,41,42. After careful consideration of the applicant's arguments and amendments, the examiner finds them to be moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This action is a non-final rejection of the claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/18/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 42 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 42 has been amended to reflect a data storage device including instructions for causing an electronic computer to perform a method..... said device comprising;.... Instructions for receiving data etc.

A computer readable medium containing executable code would be acceptable. However, the claims appear to be an apparatus containing code. The body of the claims appear to be directed to software which would not be acceptable. Applicant should claim a computer readable medium containing code as per standard computer readable medium format.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5,8-10,14,15,26-29, 36-37, 41-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/10078794 to Lewis in view of US Patent Publication 2003/0078794 to Knapp and US Patent Publication 2001/0034680 to Purcell

As per claim 1,

Lewis discloses a method for managing corporate action information including financial investment information of a particular security, of at least one entity (Abstract; page 1, paragraph 0008) said method comprising: receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data Information Server receiving a corporate action notification);

matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action);

generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and,

performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

Associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

electronically communicating through a network: (0010)

including an electronic server and an electronic database including a data memory storage device, the system programmed for; (see hardware/databases of 054-66, 0075, database for example)

said notification to at least one recipient of said corporate action data; (0010)

at least one additional notification to said recipient subsequent to said communicating first said notification; (0127, additional reminder alerts)
and, said additional notification to said recipient in association with at

least one change to at least a portion of said corporate action data.(0127, additional reminder alert, see also 00114)

Lewis doesn't explicitly disclose that change made by user is the reason for the notification and further

Associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

Knapp teaches;

disclose that change made by user is the reason for the notification (0082)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disclosures of Lewis and Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

Lewis and Knapp do not explicitly disclose;

Associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

Purcell teaches

Associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and; (0049, for example, see also 0035 tender or exchange offer for example would require surrender of the securities)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the financial data reporting platform of Lewis with the notification and communication teachings of Purcell for the motivation of automating required company communication tasks. (0005-6)

As per claim 41, Lewis discloses a system for managing corporate action information of at least one entity (Abstract; page 1, paragraph 0008), said system comprising: at least one server configured for receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data information Server receiving a corporate action notification); at least one software module configured for matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action); at least one software module configured for generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and, at least one software module Configured for performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

And said server configured for:

communicating said notification to at least one recipient of said corporate action data; (0010)

communicating at least one additional notification to said recipient subsequent to said communicating first said notification; and (0010)

communicating said additional notification to said recipient in association with at least one change made by a user to at least a portion of said corporate action data, (00127, additional reminder)

wherein said update to first said notification and is

ranked based on the importance of said update; (127, prioritization of alerts and further in 120, the ability to prioritize data from multiple sources.)

at least one software module configured for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

Lewis does not explicitly disclose change made by user is the reason for the notification and at least one software module configured for generating a master announcement summary page for reviewing said change to said corporate action data.

at least one software module configured for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

Knapp teaches;

that change made by user is the reason for the notification (0082)

at least one software module configured for generating a master announcement summary page for reviewing said change to said corporate action data. (0085) It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disclosures of Lewis and Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

Lewis and Knapp do not explicitly disclose;

at least one software module configured for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

Purcell teaches

at least one software module configured for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and;

(0049, for example, see also 0035 tender or exchange offer for example would require surrender of the securities)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the financial data reporting platform of Lewis with the notification and communication teachings of Purcell for the motivation of automating required company communication tasks. (0005-6)

As per claim 42, Lewis discloses a computer-readable medium including instructions for performing a method for managing corporate action information of at

least one entity (Abstract; page I, paragraph 0008; page 6, paragraph 0067), said medium comprising:

instructions for receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data information Server receiving a corporate action notification);

instructions for matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action);

instructions for generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and,

instructions for performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with execution of said instructions for generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

instructions for communicating said notification to at least one recipient of said corporate action data; (0010)

instructions for communicating at least one additional notification to said recipient subsequent to said communicating first said notification; (0010)

instructions for communicating said additional notification to said recipient in association with at least one change made by a user to at least a portion of said corporate action (0127, 0114)

data, wherein said change made by said user comprises an update to first said notification and is ranked based on the importance of said update:, (0120, 127)

Lewis does not explicitly disclose;

changes made by user

instructions for providing a master announcement summary page for reviewing said change to said corporate action data.

instructions for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and,

Knapp teaches;

instructions for providing a master announcement summary page for reviewing said change to said corporate action data. (0085)

at least one software module configured for generating a master announcement summary page for reviewing said change to said corporate action data. (0085) It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disclosures of Lewis and Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

Lewis and Knapp do not explicitly disclose;

instructions for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and,

Purcell teaches

instructions for associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data wherein said associated offer category includes an associated offer that requires surrender of said security and,

(0049, for example, see also 0035 tender or exchange offer for example would require surrender of the securities)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the financial data reporting platform of Lewis with the notification and communication teachings of Purcell for the motivation of automating required company communication tasks. (0005-6)

As per claim 3, Lewis discloses soliciting a response from said recipient of said notification (page 10, paragraph 0127, via tracking sent alerts and whether a response has been received).

As per claim 4, Lewis discloses soliciting a response from said recipient based on a non-response of said recipient to said notification (page 10, paragraph 0127, via tracking sent alerts and whether a response has been received, therefore a non-response is also a response of sorts).

As per claim 8, Lewis discloses tracking at least a portion of said corporate action data for identifying at least one change in position associated with said portion of

said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 01 27, via Accounting information Server updates the positions that are entitled to the proceeds from the corporate action).

As per claim 9, Lewis discloses generating at least one alert in response to at least one change in at least one eligible position associated with said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 01 27, via Accounting Information Server updates the positions that are entitled to the proceeds from the corporate action; pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Alert Notification Server sends a notification to Customers or Counterparties that are entitled to the proceeds of the corporate action).

As per claim 10, Lewis discloses said corporate action data includes data associated with a voluntary corporate action (page 10, paragraph 0127, via voluntary corporate action).

As per claim 15, Lewis discloses designating at least a portion of said corporate action data with a status of automatically notify (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via notifications are sent automatically by the Alert Notification Server).

As per claim 26, Lewis discloses a system which can make corporate action announcements (0117) but, does not explicitly disclose a master announcement summary page. Knapp teaches a summary report for suppliers (0085). It would

therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the corporate announcements of Lewis with the summary reports of Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

As per claim 28, Lewis teaches the importance of identifying updates to status. (0067) but, does not explicitly disclose using said master announcement summary page for reviewing at least one change to said corporate action data.

Knapp teaches a summary report for suppliers (0085). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the corporate announcements of Lewis with the summary reports of Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

As per claim 27, Lewis discloses the ability to identify an "eligible holder", ie 0127, for example if there is a voluntary tender, the owner can be alerted. However, Lewis, does not explicitly disclose a master summary page.

Knapp teaches a summary report for suppliers (0085). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the corporate announcements of Lewis with the summary reports of Knapp for the motivation of improving communications between parties. (0010)

As per claim 29, Lewis discloses viewing at least one user assigned to at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Customers or

Counterparties entitled to the proceeds of the corporate action are viewable through the Alert Notification Server).

As per claim 36, Lewis discloses displaying holder information associated with said corporate action data (Figure 24, via portfolio summary).

As per claim 37, Lewis discloses generating a notification for communication to at least one holder in association with said holder information (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action).

As per claim 14, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention including corporate action data notification, (00127, and flagging errors for correction by staff, 00123) , but fails to expressly disclose associating a category of incomplete notification with at least a portion of said corporate action data, for which said notification is not communicated. Knapp teaches summary reports which track incomplete palettes for example. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a summary report or tracking of incomplete items by Knapp with the flagging of incomplete items of Lewis for the motivation of;

improving communications between parties. (0010)

Claims 13, 16-17, 19-22, 30,32,33, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/10078794 to Lewis in view of US Patent Publication 2003/0078794 to Knapp and US Patent Publication 2001/0034680 to Purcell and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice and/or applicant admitted prior art.

As per claim 13, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose purging at least a portion of said corporate action data, wherein said portion of said corporate action data is not associated with an eligible position of said financial institution.

Examiner notes that the based on the previous final office action of 3/19/09 that it is applicant admitted prior art to purge a portion of data that is not associated with an eligible position. For example, if a part of a corporate action does not affect any positions held by investors via the financial institution, that portion of the data would be eliminated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include purging a portion of the corporate action data not associated with an eligible position as taught by applicant admitted prior art in order to remove irrelevant data.

As per claim 16, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention,

Including wherein said corporate data includes data associated with a voluntary corporate action. (00127)

but fails to expressly disclose designating at least a portion of said corporate action data in an aged outstanding payments category,

The existence and tracking of aged outstanding payments is considered applicant admitted prior art for the purposes of examination in the office action of 3/18/09.

It would therefore have been obvious to incorporate the applicant admitted prior art of tracking of aged payments and the voluntary corporate action data disclosures of Lewis for the purpose of managing actions in a systematic manner.

As per claim 17, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose wherein said aged outstanding payments category includes a portion of said corporate action data having a processing status one of active status and completed status, and wherein a current date is later than a predestinated expiration date associated with said portion of corporate action data, and wherein a required payment associated with said portion said corporate action data has not been received.

Keeping track of the processing status of outstanding payments is considered applicant admitted prior art based on the office action of 3/18/09, For example, if dividends are issued and the deadline for payment to investors has passed, these would be

considered aged outstanding payments. Once the payment is made, the processing status would be considered complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include keeping track of the processing status of aged outstanding payments as taught by applicant admitted prior art in order to check if processing has been completed or not.

As per claim 19, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, including wherein corporate action includes data associated with a voluntary corporate action. (00127) but fails to expressly disclose associating an uncovered protects category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

that uncovered protects (category) are considered applicant admitted prior art for the purposes of examination based on the office action of 3/18/09.. For example, a normal warrant is uncovered, as opposed to a covered warrant.

Also, many corporate actions come with protect dates, e.g. the DTC expiration date. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include uncovered protects as taught by applicant admitted prior art because they are a type of corporate action.

As per claim 20, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails

to expressly disclose associating a covered protect category with at least a portion of said portion of said corporate action data included within said uncovered protects category.

covered protects are considered applicant admitted prior art for the purposes of examination based on the office action of 3/19/09. For example, covered warrants are special kinds of warrants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include covered protects as taught by applicant admitted prior art. because they are a type of corporate action.

As per claim 21, Lewis discloses responding to clients in a variety of situations. (00127) However, Lewis fails to disclose;

to expressly disclose associating an over-committed category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Knapp teaches;

Tracking responses and the status of said responses. (0078-81), ie depending on the purpose such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Knapp could be modified to track commitment status as well;

Having at least one position that is less than the total response value for said position.

In the office action of 3/18/09, the Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to over commit for a corporate action was converted to applicant admitted prior art. For example, there may be an error with a corporate

action and the response value is greater than the actual position held.

The examiner notes that having a position that is less than the total response would be the result of a situation of over commitment. The examiner takes official notice that having at least one position that is less than the total response value would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include at least one position that is less than the total response value for said position in an over-committed category as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to recognize mistakes so they can be corrected.

As per claim 22, Lewis discloses

all elements of the claimed invention, but fails

to expressly disclose associating an under-committed category with at least a portion of said corporate action data. Having at least one position that is more than the total response value for said position.

In the office action of 3/18/09, the Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to under commit for a corporate action was converted to applicant admitted prior art. For example, there may be an error with a corporate action and the response value is greater than the actual position held.

The examiner notes that having a position that is more than the total response would be the result of a situation of under commitment. The examiner takes official notice that having at least one position that is more than the total response value would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include having at least one position that is more than the total response value as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to recognize mistakes so they can be corrected. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include an under-committed category as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to recognize mistakes so they can be corrected.

As per claim 30, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a new holders category with at least a portion of said corporate action data

having at least one of a new holder and a new position.

Applicant admitted prior art as of the office action of 3/18/09 includes that associating new holders with corporate actions is old and well known in the art. The examiner takes official notice having at least one new holder and one new position is old and well known because the corporate world is dynamic. If it is known that a new holder's category exists, then the holder having a position or holding something would be known

as well. Holders hold things, a position could be securities for example. A holder could hold a position in securities for example.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis including the admitted prior art of new holders, with having at least one new holder and new position with corporate actions as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to ensure new holders are included in the processing of a corporate action.

As per claim 32, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a competing offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data, wherein said competing offer category includes a competing offer that requires surrender of said security. In the office action of 3/18/09, competing offers for corporate actions became applicant admitted prior art. For example, voluntary corporate actions could be considered competing offers-choosing either to participate or not.

Lewis further disclosed; offers which require surrender of said security. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the applicant's admitted prior of competing offers for corporate actions are old and well known with the concept that an offer such as tender office might require surrender of said security subject to a tender offer for the motivation of facilitating tender offers wherein there are multiple tender offers which by definition would be competing.

As per claim 33, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a not fully responded category with at least a portion of said corporate action data, wherein said at least one recipient of said corporate action did not respond to said notification. In the office action of 3/18/09, Examiner perfected Official Notice that a not fully responded category is and old well known in the art. For example, if someone has not sent a complete response, it would be considered not fully responded.

Lewis teaches corporate actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a not fully responded category, wherein at least one recipient of said corporate data did not responds as taught by applicant's admitted prior art in order to keep track of incomplete responses.

Claims 38, 39, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/10078794 to Lewis in view of US Patent Publication 2003/0078794 to Knapp and US Patent Publication 2001/0034680 to Purcell further in view of US Patent 6853974 to Akifuji

As per claim 38, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails

to expressly disclose displaying a position status associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data, wherein said position status compares to the current status of said corporate action data to the status of said corporate action data where said notification is communicated.

Lewis, Purcell and Knapp do not explicitly teach position status measuring and communication, and a status response feature; (Kapp 0081 teaches a general status response)

Akifuji teaches; a response status feature (col. 5, lines 5-40) where status is recorded in the data system and tracked . It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the notification disclosure of Lewis with the response status tracking of Akifuji for the motivation of managing workflows in an efficient manner. (col. 1, lines 30-40)

As per claim 39, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose displaying a response status associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data. (Kapp 0081 teaches a general status response)

Lewis, Purcell and Knapp do not explicitly teach a status response feature; Akifuji teaches; a response status feature (col. 5, lines 5-40) where status is recorded in the data system. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the notification disclosure of Lewis with the response status tracking of Akifuji for the motivation of managing workflows in an efficient manner. (col. 1, lines 30-40)

Claims 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/10078794 to Lewis in view of US Patent Publication 2003/0078794 to Knapp and US Patent Publication 2001/0034680 to Purcell, further in view of further in view of Zangari et al. (2002/0184133).

As per claim 7, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating a list of action items associated with said corporate action data. Zangari et al. teaches a method and system for verifying in the integrity of data in a data warehouses with a corporate action processing module that generates a list of action items associated with the corporate action (page 5, paragraphs 0056-0057). From this teaching of Zangari et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action information of Lewis to include generating a list of action items associated with said corporate action data as taught by Zangari et al. in order to process the corporate action data.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell, further in view of Lupien et al. (5,101,353).

As per claim 11, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating an end-of-the-day report for displaying actions associated with said corporate action data.

Lupien et al. teaches an automated system for providing liquidity to securities

markets that generates an end-of-the-day report for displaying actions associated with said corporate action data (col. 17, lines 14-17, via updating data files to reflect corporate actions relating to all managed securities; col. 12, lines 8-20, via end-of-day reports of all transactions).

From this teaching of Lupien et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action information of Lewis to include generating an end-of-day report as taught by Lupien et al. in order to summarize all the corporate action data.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell, and further in view of Lupien et al. as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 12, the Lewis discloses a cusip, which is a security identifier (0092) and Lupien combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose grouping at least a portion of data included within said end-of-the-day report by a designation selected from the group consisting of a user name, a category, an action type, a CASPR ID.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to group data on an end-of-the-day report. For example, a report covering the day's transactions can have the transactions grouped by transaction type.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the end-of-the-day report of the Lewis and Lupien combination to include grouping data as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to

present information in an organized manner.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Graff (6,192,347).

As per claim 18, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, Lewis, Knapp and Purcell fail to expressly disclose associating a payable today category with at least a portion of said corporate action data. Graff teaches a system and method for computing to support decomposing property into separately valued components where the corporate actions have a specific payable date (col. 223, lines 21 -24).

From this teaching of Graff, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a payable date as taught by Graff in order to determine which corporate actions are payable today.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Gregov et al. (7,376,588).

As per claim 23, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, Lewis Knapp and Purcell do not explicitly disclose associating a new announcement category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Gregov et al. teaches personalized promotion of new content where information about new announcements is displayed to the user (col. 7, lines 46-50).

From this teaching of Gregov et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method for managing corporate action data of

Lewis to include new announcement information as taught by Gregov et al. in order to create a category for new announcements and keep the data more organized.

As per claim 24, Lewis discloses allowing automatic notification for at least a portion of said portion of said corporate action data included with said new announcement category (pages 1-2, paragraph 001 0, via notifications are sent automatically by the Alert Notification Server).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Haviv-Segal et al. (20020049705).

As per claim 25, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a new source category with at least a portion of said corporate action data. Haviv-Segal et al. teaches a method for creating content oriented databases and content files with a new source category (page 7, paragraph 0084, via tagging every new source). From this teaching of Haviv-Segal et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a new source category as taught by Haviv-Segal et al. in order to determine which corporate actions have new sources.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Martone et al. (20020138389).

As per claim 35, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose modifying at least one entitlement associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Martone et al. teaches a financial service system that allows modifying at least one entitlement (page 5, paragraph 0098, via updating entitlement database). From this teaching of Martone et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include modifying at least one entitlement as taught by Martone et al. in order to allow for changes.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Cornelius et al. (6,629,081).

As per claim 34, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose logging at least one change associated with said corporate action data in an audit log.

Cornelius et al. teaches account settlement and financing with an audit log (col. 78, lines 38-42). From this teaching of Cornelius et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of managing corporate action data of Lewis to include an audit log as taught by Cornelius et al. in order to create a log for auditing purposes.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knapp and Purcell and further in view of Kumagai et al. (6,996,563).

As per claim 40, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating a notification history in association with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Kumagai et al. teaches a communication system and method with notification history information (col. 8, lines 20-22).

From this teaching of Kumagai et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a notification history as taught by Kumagai et al. in order to show past notifications.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1,3,4,7-30,32-42 pending. On 9/18/09, the applicant filed an amendment amending claims 1,12, 16,19,21,22,23,25,30,32,33,38,41,42. After careful consideration of the applicant's arguments and amendments, the examiner finds them to be moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This action is a non-final rejection of the claims.

35 USC 101 - Claim 42 needs to clearly be identified in computer readable medium format to be statutory.

35 USC 103 (A) - Moot in view of applicant amendments. Purcell is added, Knapp from claims 41, 42 is applied to claim 1 in place of Akifuji.

Official Notice - where applicant has amended claims with official notice, the examiner notes that previously officially noticed concepts are admitted prior art as of the 3/18/09 office action. The examiner either applies new official notice to said amended claims, as applicable or new art to the amended portions. In regards to non-amended claims where official notice was taken in the first office action, these are considered admitted prior art and were not addressed in this action. (see prior Final office action)

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
3. 2002/0087455 to Tsagarakis

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRUCE I. EBERSMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3442. The examiner can normally be reached on 630am-5pm, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691

Bruce I Ebersman
Examiner
Art Unit 3691
